

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 8, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 17-22, leaves claims 9, 16, 23 and 24 unchanged, cancels claims 11, 14 and 25 and adds new claims 26 and 27. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 8-10, 12, 13, 15-24, 26 and 27.

Claims 8-25 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. As indicated above, claims 11, 14 and 25 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 11, 14 and 25 is rendered moot. The remaining claims 8-10, 12, 13 and 15-24 were amended to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made to claims 8-10, 12 and 13 and 15-24 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone should any further indefinite matters be discovered so that appropriate amendments may be made.

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Roderique (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,764) and claims 11-25 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roderique. As indicated above, claims 11, 14 and 25 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections with respect to claims 11, 14 and 25 are rendered moot. These rejections with respect to the remaining claims 8-

10, 12, 13 and 15-24 are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 8-10, 12, 13 and 15-24 are not taught or suggested by Roderique whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

It should be noted that the cancellation of claims 11, 14 and 25 were not intended nor should it be considered as an agreement on Applicants part that the features recited in claims 11, 14 and 25 are taught or suggested by Roderique whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. The cancellation of claims 11, 14 and 25 was simply intended to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Amendments were made to claims 8-10, 12, 13 and 15-24 in order to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Particularly, amendments were made these claims to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a method of rendering communications by a third device provided between first and second devices wherein the first device uses a first protocol using an address of a first length and the second device uses a second protocol using an address of a second length and a method relaying a packet sent from a first device using a first protocol, to a second device using a second protocol by a third device.

According to the present invention, the third device receives from the first device a first packet having a first header including a first address of the first length correlated with the second device as a destination address and including a fourth address of the first length as a source address, translates the first address into a

second address of the second length correlated with the second device, assigns one of at least one stored address of the second length to the fourth address as a third address, translates the fourth addresses into the third address, translates the first header into a second header including the second address as a destination address and the third address as a source address, creates a second packet having the second header from the first packet, and sends the second packet to the second device.

Thus, according to the present invention, the third device translates an address and a header utilizing an address pool. This feature of the present invention is taught, for example, in the specification on pages 18-24. Therefore, by use of the present invention the connection between networks can be realized while preventing the exhaustion of usable addresses. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Roderique whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Roderique merely discloses a method and apparatus for permitting a radio to originate and receive data messages in a data communications network. Roderique teaches apparatus in which a source address of an internet protocol is copied to an extended address field. However, this teaching of Roderique does not render obvious nor anticipate the features of the present invention as recited in the claims wherein a source address of an internet protocol is translated. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 11, lines 20-23 of Roderique in order to understand the teaching therein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to translate both a source address and a destination address in order for Roderique to be similar to that of the present invention. However, in Roderique, the source address need not be translated and would in fact be a wasteful use of resources and addresses in such a system since translating all of such addresses would exhaust the available addresses contrary to that of the present invention.

The purpose of the present invention is to perform translations using a pool of addresses. This feature of the present invention prevents the exhaustion of addresses in communications in networks. Such teachings are clearly not taught or suggested by Roderique.

Therefore, Roderique fails to teach or suggest receiving from the first device a first packet having a first header including a first address of the first length correlated with the second device as a destination and including a fourth address of the first length as a source address as recited in the claims.

Further, Roderique fails to teach or suggest translating the first address into a second address of the second length correlated with the second device and assigning one at least one stored address of the second length to the fourth address as a third address as recited in the claims.

Still further, Roderique fails to teach or suggest translating the fourth address into the third address and translating the first header into the second header including the second address as a destination address and the third address as a source address as recited in the claims.

Even further, Roderique fails to teach or suggest creating a second packet having the second header from the first packet and sending the second packet to the second device as recited in the claims.

Thus, as is clear from the above, the features of the present invention as recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Roderique whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 8-10 as being anticipated by Roderique and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 11-25 as being unpatentable over Roderique should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new dependent claims 26 and 27. Since these are dependent claims, the same arguments presented above with respect to claims 8-10, 12, 13 and 15-24 apply as well to these new claims 26 and 27.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 8-25.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 8-10, 12, 13, 15-24, 26 and 27 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 8-10, 12, 13, 15-24, 26 and 27 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.35522CX1).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600